REMARKS

The Official Action begins with a critique of the single drawing of the present application. As no statute, rule or MPEP section is cited, applicant understands that no actual objection is entered.

The Official Action has provided an outline for the contents of the specification. Such outline includes headings for each of the sections of the specification. A Supplemental Preliminary Amendment was submitted on April 10, 2000 that included an amendment to the specification adding section headings. Further clarification of the specification objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 were previously pending in the application. New claims 16-17 are added. Therefore, claims 1-17 are presented for consideration.

Claims 8-11 are amended to address the claim objections noted in the Official Action.

Paragraph 8 on page 5 of the Official Action is respectfully traversed. Citation to the statute, rule, or MPEP section that states the requirement that the word "claims" be preceded by a verb or a pronoun is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 12 are rejected as being anticipated by MAHONEY et al. 5,889,886.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested because the reference does not disclose or suggest analyzing the data contained in the document according to at least one of their content and their position in the document and comparing the data one by one to one or more identification criteria of documents, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

By way of example, page 12, lines 16-22 of the present application disclose that identification criteria provide characterizing a document both by its content and by the position of the data in the document. Thus an invoice can be characterized by identification such as the term "invoice" at 15 cm. from the left edge and 6 cm. from the upper edge of the document, or the term "date" at 15 cm. from the left edge and 8 cm. from the upper edge of the document. Accordingly, the document can be identified by the content, that is, containing the term "invoice", or by the position of the data such that the term "invoice" is 15 cm. from the left edge and 6 cm. from the upper edge of the document.

As set forth in the abstract of MAHONEY, MAHONEY discloses a method and apparatus for analyzing image data and more particularly for analyzing image data representing images containing text to partition the image into running and non-running text regions therein. The invention of MAHONEY utilizes characteristics of running text regions to identify situations and

to subsequently group all non-running text regions into related groups. Column 6, lines 34-39 of MAHONEY teaches that "running text" is text which comprises the body matter of a document (e.g., a page or a book). "Non-running text," is that text within a document that is not part of the body matter and includes, for example, tables, headings, captions, and lists.

Accordingly, MAHONEY teaches identifying regions of the document and not identifying the type of document or the identification criteria of that type of document such that the comparison of the data is to one or more identification criteria of documents, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Claim 4 also recites analyzing the data contained in the document according to at least one of their content and their position in the document and they are compared one by one to one or more of the identification criteria of the document. The comments above regarding claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 4.

In addition, claim 4 recites comparing the data of the document to at least one classification criterion, each criterion corresponding to a type of document to be classified. As set forth above, MAHONEY identifies regions of the document, not the type of document to be classified.

Further, MAHONEY '886 ends at column 18. The Official Action has indicated columns 21 and 23 as providing support for

when the comparison is negative there can be defined at least one new identification criterion corresponding to a type of document and at least one classification criterion corresponding to a classification in the memory of the computer in which is copied the document, and when the comparison is positive, the document is automatically copied into the memory of the computer according to the corresponding classification or classifications. Further clarification of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Column 7, lines 15-20 of MAHONEY '886 disclose that a page image is stored at least temporarily on a data storage medium or device. This passage of MAHONEY '886 does not teach positive and negative comparisons, and does not teach that when the comparison is positive, the document is automatically copied into the memory of the computer according to the corresponding classification or classifications, as recited in claim 4 of the present application.

Claim 8 recites means for copying into the memory of the computer the document upon a positive identification and means for defining at least one identification criterion and at least one classification criterion of a document upon a negative comparison.

Again the Official Action has offered columns 21 and 23 of Mahoney '886 for teaching these features. Further clarification of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8 and further define the invention and are also believed patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 12 recites analyzing data of a document by performing at least one datum analysis according to a datum content or a datum position in the document to obtain at least one datum analysis result, and obtaining a comparison result by comparing each datum analysis result to at least one document identification criteria, each identification criterion being defined by at least one of the content and the position of a datum characteristic of a document. The comments above regarding claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 12.

Claims 2-3, 5-7, and 13-15 are rejected as being unpatentable over MAHONEY et al. 5,999,664 in view of "Official Notice".

The Official Action states that MAHONEY 5,889,886 does not explicitly teach the limitations of claims 2-3, 5-7 and 13-15; however MAHONEY et al. 5,999,664 is purported to teach these limitations. Clarification of this statement is respectfully requested. Specifically, it does not appear that MAHONEY 5,889,886 is applied against claims 2-3, 5-7 and 13-15.

In any event, MAHONEY et al. '664 is a system for searching a corpus of document images by user specified document layout components. Specifically, a user inputs document search

criteria and then initializes a search. All documents that meet this search criteria are then retrieved. As seen in Fig. 7 of MAHONEY et al. `664, specific search criteria are entered to determine the layout structure of a page image of a document. MAHONEY et al. `664 do not teach or suggest analyzing data contained in the document according to at least one of their content and their position in the document, and comparing the data one by one to one or more identification criteria of documents, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

As set forth above, MAHONEY `886 does not disclose or suggest this feature. Since claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and further define the invention, the combination of references would not render obvious claims 2 and 3.

In addition, claim 2 recites that a parametric window is opened to define at least one new identification criterion associated with this document.

Column 21, lines 18-49 noted in the Official Action (in conjunction with Figure 7 of MAHONEY et al. `664) show that a limited number of features or attributes can be given a specific weight (714) to edit a model. Accordingly, existing criterion are chosen, not that a new criterion is memorized to identify thereafter any document having this datum, as recited in claim 2 of the present application.

Claim 5 also recites defining at least one new identification criterion associated with the documents. The comments above regarding claim 2 are equally applicable to claim 5.

In addition, claims 5-7 depend from claim 4 and further define the invention. MAHONEY et al. '664 was not applied against claim 4. MAHONEY '886 does not disclose or suggest what is recited in claim 4, as set forth above. Accordingly, the combination of references would not render obvious claims 5-7.

Claim 13 also recites defining at least one new identification criterion datum. The comments above regarding claim 2 are equally applicable to claim 13.

In addition, claims 13-15 depend from claim 12 and further define the invention. MAHONEY et al. '664 was not applied against claim 12. As set forth above, MAHONEY '886 does not disclose or suggest what is recited in claim 12. Accordingly, the combination of references would not render obvious claims 13-15.

New claim 16 recites that the data contained in the document is analyzed based on the content of the data. MAHONEY '886 analyzes regions of the document and does not identify the content of the document. Accordingly, MAHONEY does not analyze the document based on the content of the data. MAHONEY et al. '664 is a document search system that searches for documents

based on search criteria and does not analyze a document based on the content of the data, as recited in new claim 16.

New claim 17 depends from claim 16 and further defines the invention and is also believed patentable over the cited prior art. In addition, claim 17 recites the step of automatically filing the document's memory based on the identified criterion. As set forth above, MAHONEY '886 initiates a save file command to save the file temporarily to disk. MAHONEY et al. '664 is performing a search and is not saving a particular document. The documents of MAHONEY et al. '664 have previously been saved and are being searched based on a specific search criteria.

Accordingly, it is believed that the new claims avoid the rejections under Sections 102 and 103 and are allowable over the art of record.

By way of further explanation, the present invention concerns a method for identifying a document using a computer that has been used to create that document. Accordingly, the location and the textual content are easily identified with absolute precision, minimizing the possibility of error.

The document type is identified as opposed to the technology of the cited references that use scanning and optical character recognition methods that, by their nature, entail a loss of time and computing errors. Since the document is always

within the computer, the method of identifying the document is fast, easy and accurate compared to the prior art methods, and the classification of the document can be readily ascertained without having to first print the document and then scan the document and then do an image analysis of the document, as in the prior art.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional

fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
         (703) 979-4709

LM/mjr